Instructional Role and Scope Survey Results

The Commission shall be responsible for statewide long-range planning for
postsecondary education in Alabama. Such planning shall be the result of continuous
study, analysis and evaluation.[1] In keeping with this charge, in March 2008, the
Commission conducted a study for the purpose of classifying and prescribing the role and
scope for each public institution. The purpose of the survey was twofold: to assess
institutional need for new program development and to review instructional role and
scope policies. Hence, the survey results will be used to recommend instructional role
policies, and to inform the writing of the goals, objectives, and strategies for the State
Plan for Alabama Higher Education 2009-2014.

ACHE staff in collaboration with the Alabama Department of Postsecondary
Education Instructional Services staff distributed an instructional role survey to 2- year
and 4-year institutions to assist the Commission staff in the review of its instructional role
policies. Historically, the instructional role policy adopted in October 2001 states that
"no role expansion will be approved for any institution at a higher degree level than
currently offered unless required by any consent or remedial decrees related to the Title
VI desegregation case." This policy has not been updated since October 2001.

Results from 36 reporting institutions that completed the survey are indicated
below. The number of respondents and the percentages are given to show how the
colleges and universities agree or disagree with the present policy. Results are reported
in the aggregate as well as by 2-yr, 4-yr classifications. Seventy-one percent responded

---

[1]Ala. Code Section 16-5-6, and 16-5-10, and through guidelines outlined in the ACHE Academic Affairs
and Planning Policies and Procedures Manual, revised April 14, 2008.

yes to Question #1 indicating that they agreed with the policy adopted by the

Commission in 2001. Question #2 did not indicate a yes or no response, but is included

in an open-ended report later. Ninety-three percent agreed with Question #5 that the

policy should be reviewed every five years as a part of the Commission's statutory long-

range planning efforts.

Instructional Role and Scope Survey Results

TABLE 1 *Instructional Role and Scope Survey Results from All Institutions*

Survey Question	Yes N (%)	No N (%)
1. Do you agree with the instructional role policy adopted in 2001?	24(67)	12(33)
2. If no, what changes to the policy should be considered? (see Table 4 Summary of responses)		
3. The Commission should use the approval of academic programs defined in Question #1 above as the means to review any requests from colleges and universities to expand their instructional role and scope.	28(78)	8(22)
4. The Commission should limit expansion of instructional role and scope to the current degree-granting level of the institution.	23(64)	13(36)
5. The instructional role and scope policy should be reviewed every five years as a part of the Commission's statutory long-range planning efforts.*	33(94)	2(6)
6. The Commission should consider the approval of specific academic programs outside the instructional role and scope when there is exceptionally strong demonstrated state need for the program.*	33(94)	2(6)
7. If yes, the offering of the specific program would not change the institution's instructional role and scope, but would be limited to the approved program only.*	30(88)	4(12)

* denotes Missing response(s) to selected question

TABLE 2 displays information from two-year colleges. The number of respondents and their respective percentages show how they agree or disagree with the present policy.

TABLE 2   *Instructional Role and Scope Surveys 23 of the 26 2-Year Institutions*

Survey Question	Yes N (%)	No N (%)
1. Do you agree with the instructional role policy adopted in 2001?	17(74)	6(26)
2. If no, what changes to the policy should be considered? (see Table 4 Summary of responses))		
3. The Commission should use the approval of academic programs defined in Question #1 above as the means to review any requests from colleges and universities to expand their instructional role and scope.	20(87)	3(13)
4. The Commission should limit expansion of instructional role and scope to the current degree-granting level of the institution.	16(70)	7(30)
5. The instructional role and scope policy should be reviewed every five years as a part of the Commission's statutory long-range planning efforts.*	22(100)	0(0)
6. The Commission should consider the approval of specific academic programs outside the instructional role and scope when there is exceptionally strong demonstrated state need for the program.	23(100)	0(0)
7. If yes, the offering of the specific program would not change the institution's instructional role and scope, but would be limited to the approved program only.	23(100)	0(0)

* denotes Missing response(s) to selected question

TABLE 3 displays information from four-year universities. The number of respondents and their respective percentages shows how colleges and universities agree or disagree with the present policy.

TABLE 3 *Instructional Role and Scope Surveys 13 of the 14 4-year Institutions*

Survey Question	Yes N (%)	No N (%)
1. Do you agree with the instructional role policy adopted in 2001?	7(54)	6(46)
2. If no, what changes to the policy should be considered? (see Table 4 Summary of responses))		
3. The Commission should use the approval of academic programs defined in Question #1 above as the means to review any requests from colleges and universities to expand their instructional role and scope.	8(62)	5(38)
4. The Commission should limit expansion of instructional role and scope to the current degree-granting level of the institution.	7(54)	6(46)
5. The instructional role and scope policy should be reviewed every five years as a part of the Commission's statutory long-range planning efforts.	11(85)	2(15)
6. The Commission should consider the approval of specific academic programs outside the instructional role and scope when there is exceptionally strong demonstrated state need for the program.*	10(83)	2(17)
7. If yes, the offering of the specific program would not change the institution's instructional role and scope, but would be limited to the approved program only.*	7(64)	4(36)

* denotes Missing response to selected question

TABLE 4 *Written responses to open-ended Question #2*

Question 2
If no, what changes to the policy statement should be considered?

R1:   No response

R2:   Two-year colleges should be able to offer expanded coursework/degree program in high-demand field where appropriate

R12:   Given changing times and economic development activities in Alabama, policy should be revised to offer the opportunity for institutions to request approval for such expansion.

R13:   Current policy does not allow institutions to expand role and scope

R17:   This policy should be discontinued, and new program proposals should be judged on their merits. Such artificial constraints do not acknowledge the dynamic nature of a university and the growing shifting educational needs of its service area.

R19:   The 2001 policy does not give the Commission the flexibility to take into account the changing workforce development needs in Alabama and the need for our citizens to pursue a variety of degrees as their career change over time. Rather than using academic programs as the operational definition for role and scope, the Commission would be better served by adopting the definitions of the 2005 Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

R22:   The policy stifles institutional growth and development regardless of factors that might warrant expansion which might be beneficial to the community and state.

R25:   If new program proposals would result in a role expansion for any university or two-year college, the NISP step should inform ACHE of that result.

Summary of Instructional Role and Scope Survey Comments

Question 1
Do you agree with the stated policy?
Only one respondent disagreed with the present policy.

Question 2
If no, what changes to the policy statement should be considered?
Most comments stated that the policy should allow for institutional expansion and growth. The present policy should be amended to include new program proposals based on merits and the dynamics of the institution. Moreover, the policy stifles institutional growth as it applies today.

Question 3
The Commission should use the approval of academic programs as defined in Questions #1 as the means to review any requests from colleges and universities to expand their instructional role and scope.
The comments state that the policy suggests any approved program is translated into role expansion. This may not be the case because any changes are primarily industry-driven, especially at the same degree level. Adding new CIP programs is different than seeking a higher degree program.

Question 4
The Commission should limit expansion of instructional role and scope to the current degree-granting level of the institution.
The institutions are industry-driven and should not be limited in considering changes to their programs to meet the needs of the surrounding community.

Question 5
The instructional role and scope policy should be reviewed every five-years as part of the Commission's statutory long-range planning efforts.
Most agreed to review the policy every 3-5 years because demographics may change impacting program demand. One respondent stated that it was left to the Commission to decide what is in the best interest of Alabama.

Question 6
The Commission should consider the approval of specific academic programs outside the instructional role and scope of an institution when there is exceptionally strong demonstrated state need for the program.
All respondents agreed with this statement noting changing community needs and an industry-driven economy.

Question 7

If yes to #6, the offering of the specific program would not change the institution's instructional role and scope, but would be limited to the approval program only.

There were only five responses to this item.

Question 8

Considering the next five years, list your institution's priorities for academic technical, or workforce program development in term of fields of study.

Ranked in order of most in common

1. Industrial Maintenance
2. Automotive Manufacturing
3. Health Programs/Nursing
4. Electronics
5. Biotechnology/Nanotechnology

Section A

Of the above named academic technical, or workforce program priorities, which ones have the greatest importance as part of a state incentive and/or economic development effort?

Ranked in order of most in common

1. Industrial Maintenance
2. Health Care
3. Robotics

Section B

How do the above listed program priorities relate to state incentive and/or economic development efforts?

Most agreed that the priority programs are related to their respective institution's role and scope. Suggestions include Boeing/United Launch Alliance & NASA, Federal Department of Labor, the Governor's Workforce, UWA Regional Center for Community and Economic Development, and the State's health delivery system.

Question 9
Considering the next five years, list your institution's priorities for academic program development in terms of certificate and/or degree level.

Some of the listed programs included the following: Industrial Maintenance, Physical and Respiratory Therapy, Computer and Forensics Sciences, Emergency Management (DSc.), and Doctorate in Education.

1. UAH – Develop 10 new interdisciplinary programs
2. Enterprise –Ozark Community College – Forensic Science, Nanotechnology
3. Snead State Community College – Certificate Technical programs
4. Southern Union State – Industrial Maintenance/Electronics
5. Calhoun Community – Physical and Respiratory Therapy, Robotics, Nanotechnology
6. Wallace State-Hanceville – Computer Forensics
7. J.F. Drake State Technical – Expand math and science technology programs
8. Wallace Community-Selma – Robotics, INT
9. Wallace Community-Dothan – Expand general education
10. Faulkner State Community – Offer short-term certificates
11. Jefferson Davis Community – Health care and Industrial electronics
12. Central Alabama Community – New Certificate and/or Associate programs
13. Bevill State Community – Continue academic transfer courses
14. UAB – Health care, engineering, business, education, technology, social sciences and the arts
15. Troy University – Priorities depend on community needs
16. Auburn University – On-going technical areas
17. University of Alabama System – Engineering, Biotechnology, STEM, Teacher Education, Biomedical
18. Alabama State University – At the Bachelor's and Master's level
19. Jacksonville State University - DSc. In Emergency Management, M.F.A, Doctorate in Education (for administrators), M.S.W, certificate in Community Development
20. Reid State Technical College – Clinical Laboratory Technology, Registered Nursing, Machine Shop Technology
21. University of North Alabama – Civic Leadership, Geospatial, and Engineering Technology, Biotechnology, Film/Digital Media, International Studies, Master's in ESL, and Culinary Arts.